

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,465	05/03/2001	Igor Philip Passos Proglhof	J&J-1735	J&J-1735 6958	
27777	7590 07/16/2003				
	. CIAMPORCERO JR.	EXAMINER			
JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA			STEPHENS, JA	CQUELINE F	
NEW BRUN	SWICK, NJ 08933-7003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3761		
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003	\mathcal{G}	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					
	•	Applicat		Applicant(s)	- />
ĵ	Office Action Summary	09/848,4		PROGLHOF ET AL.	()2\
i	omce Action Summary	Examine	er	Art Unit	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication		ne F Stephens	3761	
Period fo	, ,				
I HE - Exte after - If the - if NC - Failt - Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commuse period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply wreply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even inication. of days, a reply within the state utory period will apply and virill, by statute, cause the and	vent, however, may a tutory minimum of th vill expire SIX (6) MO	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing of this communical	lion.
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>23 April 2003</u>			
2a)⊠		b) This action is			
3) 🗌 Dispositi	Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the praction of Claims	for allowance excep ce under <i>Ex parte</i> G	ot for formal ma Quayle, 1935 C	ntters, prosecution as to the ments D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	s is
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the a	pplication.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 and 16 is	s/are withdrawn from	n consideratior		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.				
7) 🗆	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Applicati	Claim(s) are subject to restricti on Papers	on and/or election r	equirement.	·	
	The specification is objected to by the	Evaminer			
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		objected to by	ho Evaminor	
'-	Applicant may not request that any object	•			
11) 🗆 🗆	The proposed drawing correction filed				
	If approved, corrected drawings are requ			meapproved by the Examiner.	
12) 🗌 🏾	The oath or declaration is objected to b			•	
1	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		,		
1	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo	or foreian priority un	der 35 U.S.C.	\$ 119(a)-(d) or (f)	
1	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	3 ,,		5 · · · · (a) (a) or (i).	
	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have bee	n received		
	2. Certified copies of the priority do			pplication No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority docume	ents have been		
* S	application from the Internat ee the attached detailed Office action	ional Bureau (PCT	Rule 17.2(a)).	•	
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for	domestic priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional applicat	tion).
a) 15)□ A	☐ The translation of the foreign langucknowledgment is made of a claim for	uage provisional ap domestic priority u	plication has bonder 35 U.S.C.	een received. §§ 120 and/or 121.	
Attachment					
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape	0-948) er No(s)		Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
U.S. Patent and Tra PTO-326 (Rev	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Office Action Summar	1	Part of Paper No. 9	

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a core formed from a wet laid paper) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Claim 1 recites "said core further comprising an absorption sheet and a superabsorbent material adhered to an inner surface of the sheet, said sheet consisting essentially of a wet laid paper". Plischke in col. 26, lines 55-57 describes an absorbent core **41** comprising, not formed from, an absorbent sheet consisting essentially of a wet laid tissue.

Applicant additionally reiterated the sheet is recited as *consisting essentially of a wetlaid paper* and Plischke describes a wetlaid sheet superimposed on a core. For the purposes of applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." If an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the

Art Unit: 3761

characteristics of applicant's invention. See *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d870, 143 USPQ 256 (CPA 1964). MPEP 2111.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plischke et al. USPN 5977014.

As to claims 1 and 10, Plischke discloses a sanitary absorbent article **40** comprising: an upper layer **50** pervious to liquid; a lower layer **51** impervious to liquid; a transfer layer **42** (col. 16, lines 38-44); and, an absorbing core having an upper part and a lower part, said core further comprising an absorption sheet **41,43** and a superabsorbent material **44** adhered to an inner surface of the sheet, said sheet consisting essentially of a wet laid paper (col. 26, lines 51-57) and comprising two opposite longitudinal sides, each said longitudinal side having been bent onto the inner surface (Figure 9).

As to claims 2 and 11, Plischke discloses the absorbing core is embossed and perforated (Figures 15-18).

As to claims 3 and 12, see Figure 17. 3.

Art Unit: 3761

As to claim 8, Plischke discloses the superabsorbent material has a Performance under Pressure capacity value of at least about 23 g/g under a confining pressure of 0.7 psi (col. 24, line 67 through col. 25, line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plischke in view of Hoey et al. USPN 3403681 and further in view of Schreiber USPN 2418907. Plischke discloses the present invention substantially as

Art Unit: 3761

claimed. However, Plischke does not disclose the absorbent core comprises 2 to 15 elevations per cm² both in the upper part and in the lower part, 2 to 15 perforations per cm² both in the upper part and in the lower part. Hoey discloses an apertured absorbent core having apertures spaced at 10 per square inch. Hoey does not disclose the exact aperture range. However, Hoey recognizes the aperture range can be varied and this will affect the liquid distribution and comfort of the pad ('681 col. 4, lines 14-29). Hoey, therefore recognizes the liquid distribution and comfort of the user is a result effective variable of aperture range. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the article of Plischke with the claimed range of apertures, since discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Plischke/Hoey do not disclose the apertures being present on the upper and lower part of the core. Schreiber discloses an absorbent system with embossed surfaces on upper and lower parts of the core (Figure 3) for the benefit of providing pockets to retain materials in the core ('907 col. 4, lines 18-27). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the invention of Plischke/Hoey with an embossed surface on the upper and lower parts of the core for the benefits disclosed in Schreiber.

7. Claims 6, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plischke in view of Goldman et al. USPN 5669894.

As to claims 6 and 9. Plischke does not disclose the superabsorbent material

Art Unit: 3761

has an absorbency under load value of at least about 24 ml saline per gram of superabsorbent material and a Saline Flow Conductivity value of at least about $30 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ sec/g}$. Goldman discloses an absorbent article having superabsorbent materials having an absorbency under load value of at least about 24 ml saline per gram of superabsorbent material (col. 4, lines 24-34) and a Saline Flow Conductivity value of at least about $30 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ sec/g}$ ('894 Abstract) for the purpose of minimizing gel blocking. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the superabsorbent of Goldman in the invention of Plischke for the benefits disclosed in Goldman.

As to claim 7, Plischke/Goldman do not disclose the superabsorbent material has a porosity of at least about 0.15. the claimed porosity. However, Plischke/Goldman teaches porosity is an important measurement of the effectiveness of the superabsorbent ('894 col. 13, line 35-63). It is evident that Plischke/Goldman has a value for the porosity. Plischke/Goldman recognizes the porosity can be varied and this will affect the permeability of the article. Plischke/Goldman, therefore recognizes the permeability (SFC) of the superabsorbent layer is a result effective variable of porosity of the superabsorbent. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the article of Plischke/Goldman with the claimed porosity, since discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3761

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F Stephens whose telephone number is (703) 308-8320. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (703)308-1957. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3590 for regular communications and (703) 306-4520 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Jacqueline F Stephens
Examiner
Art Unit 3761

July 12, 2003

WEILUN LO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700